

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 of the present application remain pending. Claim 22 is amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the Claim amendment.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-9, 11-14, and 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Roberts (Pub. No. U.S.2002/0149571, hereinafter referred to as "Roberts." The Applicants respectfully submit that the claim limitations recited in Claims 1, 16, and 22 of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Roberts. For example, Claim 1 of the present invention recites (emphasis added):

A display assembly for a handheld electronic device comprising:
a display mechanism;
a plurality of pressure activated sensors; and
a single-piece bezel-less top cover enclosing said handheld electronic device to allow mechanical transfer between said top cover and said plurality of pressure activated sensors, wherein said pressure activated sensors can be activated by mechanical pressure applied to the external surface of said single-piece cover enclosure.

Claim 16 of the present invention recites (emphasis added):

A display assembly for a handheld electronic device comprising:
a display mechanism of flat panel display technology;
a transparent single-piece cover enclosing said handheld electronic device that is bezel-less and is disposed over a top surface of said display mechanism and operable to allow mechanical transfer of pressure to said display mechanism; and
a plurality of pressure activated sensors disposed under said display mechanism and, responsive to said mechanical transfer of said display mechanism, operable for registering a contact point on said transparent single-piece cover.

Claim 22 of the present invention recites (emphasis added):

A display assembly for a handheld electronic device comprising:

a display mechanism of flat panel display technology;

a back cover;

a transparent single-piece cover enclosing said handheld electronic device that is bezel-less enclosing said handheld electronic device; and

a plurality of pressure activated sensors disposed between said transparent single-piece cover and said back cover and, responsive to pressure asserted on said transparent single-piece cover, operable for registering a contact point on said transparent single-piece cover.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Roberts does not teach or suggest a single-piece bezel-less cover which encloses a handheld electronic device as claimed.

For example, Figures 2 and 3 of Roberts clearly show a bezel 203 which is also taught in paragraphs 98 and 119 of the specification. This bezel is also clearly shown in Figures 6, 7A-7C, 8, and 14C and paragraphs 126, 136, 138-9, 141-2, and 164 of the specification. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in independent Claims 1, 16, and 22 are not anticipated by Roberts which requires a bezel and that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are overcome.

Claims 2-9 and 11-15 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants

respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 2-9 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are also overcome.

Claims 17-21 depend from Claim 16 and recite additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are also overcome.

Claims 23-35 depend from Claim 22 and recite additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are also overcome.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of Robsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,309), hereinafter referred to as "Robsky." The Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed embodiments of the present invention are not rendered obvious by Roberts alone or in combination with Robsky.

Claim 10 of the present invention recites a single-piece bezel-less top cover which is a transparent rigid cover. The rejection states that Robsky teaches a single-piece bezel-less top cover that is a rigid top cover in column 3, lines 52-54 of Robsky. The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion of Robsky only teaches that the wrinkled membrane 24 is drawn taught once the pre-tensioned sections of the outer walls (e.g., 22 of Figure 1) are released. However, the teaching of Robsky clearly states that a touch or pressure on the membrane deflects it to touch the substrate and make electrical contact (column 1, lines 12-13). If the membrane did not deflect under touch or pressure, the apparatus of Robsky would be unusable. Thus, Robsky only teaches a tensioned, yet still flexible, conductive membrane rather than the transparent rigid cover as recited in Claim 10. The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination does not teach or suggest the claim limitation recited in Claim 10 of a transparent rigid cover.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Roberts fails to overcome the shortcomings of Robsky. More specifically, Roberts also does not teach or suggest a rigid transparent single-piece bezel-less cover which encloses a handheld electronic device. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also overcome.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts in view of McIntyre et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,630,928), hereinafter referred to as "McIntyre." The Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed embodiments of the present invention are not rendered obvious by Roberts alone or in combination with McIntyre.

Claim 15 depends from Claim 1 and recites additional limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. As discussed above with reference to Claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that Roberts fails to teach or suggest a single-piece bezel-less top cover enclosing a handheld electronic device.

The Applicants respectfully submit that McIntyre fails to overcome the shortcomings of Roberts. More specifically, McIntyre fails to teach or suggest a single-piece bezel-less top cover enclosing a handheld electronic device as recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, Figure 1 of McIntyre clearly shows a bezel surrounding the area of touch pad 13. Thus, the combination of Roberts and McIntyre fails to teach or suggest a single-piece bezel-less top cover enclosing a handheld electronic device and which further has indentations to indicate button functions as recited in Claim 15 of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also overcome.

CONCLUSION


Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-25 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 11/9/2007



Anthony C. Murabito

Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street

Third Floor

San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060